

CIRIS

STAT

As has discussed with you, the Consolidated Intelligence Resources Information System (CIRIS) is the current iteration of a long-standing effort on the part of the DCI Staff to acquire and present in an orderly and useful manner various information concerning community intelligence resources and their application.

In the current time frame and in the structure of things the DCI has been charged to do, I believe there are several significant points to be made regarding the construction and use of CIRIS.

1. In the recent past the system has contained largely static and historical data. We believe it should be made into a dynamic system--capable of reflecting change in a more timely manner.

2. This naturally leads one to question the use to which CIRIS will be put. We believe it should serve the entire community in accordance with the needs of individual program managers and various management echelons. Most important, CIRIS should not serve as a basis for management decisions, but should instead be the means to identify specific areas or issues which need deeper examination.

3. Except within NSA and CIA, we are not aware of any established management information system, either for individual program or groupings of programs, which can serve the needs of the community on a common basis. We believe such a system is needed, to provide one is a reasonable function of the DCI, and CIRIS provides the foundation work for such a development.

4. Several improvement actions are needed to make CIRIS more complete, more precise and more responsive to the variety of purposes to be served by a proper management information system. These problems are now under study within the DCI Staff, and we propose extending this study to the community for a complete identity of purposes to be served and means of responding.

5. Concurrently, CIRIS needs to be made less burdensome to the various echelons and activities who are asked to input raw data for system construction. We believe that major strides have been made in this direction in the current data call, but more can probably be done. This point also is included in the current DCI study and should be considered by the community.

6. A final point to be made is to identify the fact that the CY72 CIRIS has been restructured to match with and reflect the prioritized requirements stated in DCID 1/2 and Annex A of the JSOP.

I would now like to discuss each of these major points in more detail in order to arrive at an understanding of the DCI objectives and the community usefulness of CIRIS or whatever other management information system may evolve from it.

Point 1: Make CIRIS dynamic

Past TOD and CIRIS data calls have covered the approved year and the budget year. By the time all requested data was collected, entered into the system and available for display, the second, or budget year, was well along and was nearly an approved year. In the program/budget cycle, work is by then already under way on the next year, which is not reflected in CIRIS.

To relate this to our present circumstances, the CY71 CIRIS data call covered FY71 approved resources and FY72 resources as requested in the President's budget. This data was received, entered into the system and was available for display by about July 1971. The aberrations to the FY72 program and budget which have occurred since these data were provided have resulted in our FY72 displays being practically useless. FY71, now an historical year, is the most reliable information CIRIS can currently display. We have not had access to all the decision documents and FYDP updates which would enable us to keep CIRIS relatively current with changes made in the FY72 budget and resource allocations. In fact, even as of now--March 1972--

we do not have firm and official figures on what has happened to the allocation of FY72 resources, and we are nearly three-quarters of the way through the year.

This year we have in our data call requests to submit FY72 actual, FY73 as requested in the President's budget and FY74 as programmed. We readily recognize that our request for FY74 data is highly unrealistic until the final impact of FY72 allocations and FY73 pre-Congressional decisions are known. We have included FY74 at the insistence of OMB, who argue that we need to display this advance resource planning in order to be able to trace the changes which occur during the various steps in the review cycle and Congressional action. We are well aware of the artificiality of trying to display a program year and to trace it through in a meaningful way. We solicit your views on a more effective way of acquiring data which can be displayed dynamically without introducing the burden and artificiality of out-year data which is so fragile. There needs to be community agreement on how we can do a manageable job effectively in order that we can convince OMB of the impracticality of their demands.

Mr. Tweedy's request to you for official distribution of certain program documents, including decision documents and FYDP updates, was intended to serve this purpose, among others. We believe that the ability to enter these data into the system in a

timely manner will help us achieve a more dynamic display of greater usefulness to the entire community. This, of course, implies cooperation from the individual program managers to provide the more detailed impact of these decisions on the elements and sub-elements of their programs. We realize that these decision translation actions take time. Our only desire is to get them as promptly as possible in order that we can provide as timely an output as possible. This naturally leads to my next point--who will use CIRIS and for what?

Point 2: The Use of CIRIS

We have two objectives under this point: (1) that CIRIS should serve the entire community, and (2) that CIRIS should provide the data necessary to initiate and conduct comparisons, evaluations and deeper examinations into specific issue areas. It is unlikely and undesirable that CIRIS would serve as the basis for resource decisions at any echelon. This prohibition can be made effective if CIRIS can be structured to show changes in a relatively current time frame and also be devoid of the intimate detail which would enable such decisions to be made. Stated differently, if CIRIS is dynamic but somewhat gross, the users of the system will be compelled to look deeper and give more deliberate consideration before arriving at resource decisions.

Thus, the need for somewhat less detail in the system can serve as a built-in control over its use and should also contribute to making the data input less burdensome, which is my fifth point.

As to specific uses to which CIRIS can be put, I have some examples.

(Show and Discuss 4 or 5 Examples)

Point 3: Need for an Information System

The identified lack of management information systems in the intelligence community is not meant to be critical. To a large extent, the environment needed to cause creation of such a system and supporting program systems has not existed until very recent years. CIA has a system which is effective for management of the monolithic structure of the Agency. But it is designed as a fiscal management system rather than as a system to permit measurement of proper resource allocation and resource effectiveness. The NSA structure with the Service Cryptologic Agencies is more complicated organizationally and programatically, but the NSA mission is concerned with bounded and isolateable functions which lend themselves to central management. Both the CIA and NSA internal management information systems are presumably appropriate for agency purposes, but are not designed

to fill community needs in a manner compatible with management information on all the community programs.

Last fall the DASD(I) Staff discussed with DIA the possibility of asking DIA to accept responsibility for creating and maintaining a DoD intelligence management information system. This system would, among other things, be designed to support the needs of your office and staff for management information. So far as I know, this proposition is still in the discussion stage with no specific development of a system having been undertaken.

Such a DoD system could be structured within the framework of CIRIS or, of course, completely apart from it. Preliminary estimates from DIA concluded that at least 18 months would be required to create the nucleus of a Defense system if undertaken independent of CIRIS. Some thought this amount of time was overly optimistic. The cost of such a development was estimated at \$400,000, and some thought the cost would be at least double that amount.

Measured against these contemplations, I submit that CIRIS exists today as a reasonably effective management information system readily adaptable to community needs, including the very substantial Defense portion. CIRIS has been criticized in the past. Some of this criticism was valid as the new and

extremely complicated system evolved. Much of the criticism was not so valid in that it came from those who were aware of the detail being sought without knowing the ultimate purposes to be served. Others who criticized the system were those who could and should have been users of it, but declined to do so. Thus, they never were able to appreciate the uses to which it could be put nor were they in a position to be helpful in modifying the system to make it less troublesome or more responsive.

I think we must accept the fact that the DCI needs some sort of community information system in order to carry out his assigned roles. CIRIS is at least the forerunner of that system. To reduce the cost of system development, to limit data calls on otherwise busy program managers and reporting activities, and to have a system which will perform a service of common concern, we propose that CIRIS, modified as necessary, be that community system.

To that end, my remaining three discussion points relate to system improvement actions, easing of the data call burden, and the already-accomplished restructuring to reflect current DoD and community-wide priority requirement statements.

Point 4: CIRIS Improvement Study

As the CY72 CIRIS data call was being developed and in recognition of concern about CIRIS known to exist in the community,

Mr. Tweedy in mid-January set up a study group to review CIRIS and to recommend modifications required to make the data system responsive to the needs of the DCI and his supporting staff. This study is now under way with completion scheduled for 1 July or sooner.

The approach being taken in this study is to identify the specific needs of the four principal elements of the DCI Staff-- comptroller, plans and evaluation, product review, and long-range analysis. Each of these groups is represented on the study team, and our initial action has been to identify the work of these staff groups which can or needs to be supported by CIRIS-type data, either existing or as modified.

Without attempting to pre-judge the outcome of the study, I can give some insight into the needs we have identified.

Comptroller--This type of support is fairly clear-cut because it involves essentially print-outs of dollar and manpower levels by different years and in various arrays such as by program, by function or by cost category. I personally believe that this support is little more than mechanical and is probably the least unique as a CIRIS capability.

Plans and Evaluation--This should be the area deriving the greatest support from CIRIS. It is contemplated that the DCI will issue annually a community planning guidance document. This

guidance should review where we are in our total intelligence community effort, where we should be going and thus where there needs to be increased, changed or decreased emphasis. These aspects need to be stated in a way that can be translated into resource programming by the program managers and also be used as a measure of program achievement by various review levels. An effective management information system will be the foundation upon which this type of program planning guidance will be built. The quality and timeliness of CIRIS data and the ability to break it out in a number of different ways, particularly in the target and resource application areas, will be directly reflected in the quality and usefulness of the planning guidance.

The evaluation function will be the most continuous user of CIRIS, and these uses should see the greatest variety of data base application. This function will represent the conduct of issue studies, effectiveness evaluations and result in resource level recommendations. As I said earlier, CIRIS displays will point to areas where issue studies should be conducted and can be used to prove or disprove theoretical explorations. Moreover, this application need not and should not be limited to the DCI Staff. All program managers and review levels should have equal access to the data for similar purposes, and the data files should be structured to support all such needs.

Product review--This is the newest element of the DCI Staff and one whose objectives and methodologies are still evolving. Nevertheless, the ability of CIRIS to support the effort is already established on the basis of earlier planning studies from which some of the examples I showed you were drawn. Although largely limited to the production arrays in CIRIS, this represents the culmination of all other efforts in the intelligence community and should be the most significant evaluations to be supported by CIRIS. The system will also be available to support similar efforts undertaken within individual programs, particularly by DIA.

Long-range analysis--Since this effort will, in the main, be a projection beyond the five-year period covered by the programming system, CIRIS support will be essentially for comparative purposes or to serve as a base from which to project. The long-range analysis will, however, be an essential ingredient in the program planning guidance, and a dynamic CIRIS will provide the yardstick by which program achievement is measured.

I am sure there are other useful applications of CIRIS-type data among program managers or management review echelons. In order that these can be identified and their support provided for, it appears desirable to extend the CIRIS study effort to the whole intelligence program community. If you desire such participation by your staff and your program managers, we are prepared to make

the necessary provision. Thus we would hope to incorporate the greatest number of desired revisions into our planning for the CY73 data call and CIRIS structure.

Point 5: Make CIRIS less burdensome

The detail required of many relatively low-echelon reporting entities, particularly among GDIP activities, has been the source of the greatest amount of probably valid criticism of CIRIS. I believe there are ways to simplify this.

Much of the data called for each year is either available from program managers in Washington (to include the Military Service headquarters) or is repetitive without significant change year after year. This suggests that data calls could be structured to confine most inputs to the Washington level. We could leave to the discretion of each program manager how much input he requires from the field and at what intervals. Also, toward making the system as dynamic as possible, we could leave updating actions to each program manager, expecting him to input new data whenever there is significant change. This would avoid the annual flood of forms which each activity is asked to fill out, much of the information being the same as that submitted previously.

These are some thoughts on how we could reduce the reporting burden. They have not been explored in depth, but it would appear beneficial to consult with the program managers

and perhaps the Services on such actions. So, if you would agree to join in our CIRIS improvement study, we would solitict ideas on these simplification actions as well as on your system support requirements.

Point 6: Priority requirements compatibility

The instructions already prepared for the CY72 CIRIS data call describe how the new USIB-agreed DCID 1/2 priority requirements list has been incorporated into the CIRIS structure. This same compatibility, of course, applies to the priority requirements listed in Annex A of JSOP because the two lists were prepared in consonance with each other.

In this first iteration of applying DCID 1/2, CIRIS uses about 90 percent of the stated requirements. The first six requirements relating to "warning" were not included because resources are generally not separately targetable against these. Additionally, the requirement for "target information" was not included because of the very wide variety of resources from which target materials can come.

The integration of the DCID 1/2 objectives into CIRIS will certainly improve with time and experience, and we can anticipate a display where a greater proportion of our total resources will be targeted against the specific ingredients contributing to fulfillment of our agreed-upon national and command intelligence objectives.

This presentation has given you the history leading to the present situation in a DCI management information system, a description of how the present system is structured and used, and our views of the future system development and utilization.

We urge your favorable consideration of this system as the basis for a Defense intelligence management information system. We encourage greater use of the system by your program managers and your staff.

If you are favorably inclined toward doing so, we also request Defense participation in our CIRIS improvement study in order that Defense needs for system support can be identified and also Defense ideas for system improvement can be applied.

MEMORANDUM FOR:

Nate.

This is my only copy. It is first draft and unedited. Please look it over and give me your reactions.

Mac

(DATE)

FORM NO. 101 REPLACES FORM 10-101
1 AUG 54 WHICH MAY BE USED.

(47)